

Variation in microclimate associated with dispersed-retention harvests in coniferous forests of western Washington

Troy D. Heithecker*, Charles B. Halpern

College of Forest Resources, Box 352100, University of Washington, Seattle Washington 98195-2100, USA

Abstract

Green-tree or structural retention is becoming increasingly common as a method of regeneration harvest in the Pacific Northwest. Amelioration of microclimatic stress is assumed to be one mechanism by which overstory retention enhances the survival of forest organisms and the potential for ecosystem recovery following timber harvest. We examined patterns of transmitted light (photosynthetic photon flux density, PPFD), air and soil temperature, and soil moisture across a broad gradient of dispersed retention in mature, coniferous forests at three locations in western Washington. Treatment means and within-treatment variation (coefficients of variation among sample points within treatments) were compared for warm, sunny days in 6- to 7-year-old experimental harvest units representing 0, 15, 40, and 100% retention of original basal area. Multiple linear regression was used to explore relationships between microclimate and plot-scale measures of forest structure (including overstory attributes, understory vegetation, and logging slash). PPFD and mean and maximum air and soil temperatures decreased with level of retention. PPFD showed the strongest response, but did not differ between 40 and 100% retention. Mean and maximum air temperatures were significantly greater at 0 and 15% retention than at 100%. Among harvest treatments (0, 15, and 40%), mean air temperature was significantly lower at 40 than at 0%, but maximum air temperature did not differ among treatments. Mean and maximum soil temperatures differed only between 0 and 100% retention. Minimum air and soil temperatures and late-summer soil moisture did not differ among treatments. Within-treatment variability (CV) did not differ significantly with level of retention for any of the variables sampled, but CVs for soil temperature showed a consistent increase with decreasing retention. In combination, topography, residual forest structure, and understory variables were good predictors of PPFD and mean and maximum temperatures (R^2 of 0.55-0.85 in multiple regression models), but were poorer predictors of minimum temperatures and soil moisture (R^2 of 0.10-0.51). Canopy cover appeared most frequently in the models and cover of understory vegetation was a significant predictor in models of soil temperature. Trends in microclimate among experimental treatments were consistent, in large part, with the early responses of bryophyte, herbaceous, and fungal communities at these sites. Our results suggest that 15% retention, the current minimum standard on federal forests within the range of the northern spotted owl, does little to ameliorate microclimatic conditions relative to traditional clearcut logging.

Keywords: DEMO, Forest management; Forest microclimate; Light; Pacific Northwest; Structural retention; Temperature; Variable-retention harvest

*Corresponding author. Present address: USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, 2770 Sherwood Lane, Suite 2A, Juneau, AK 99801, USA. Tel.: +1 907 586 8811; fax +1 907 586 7848.

E-mail address: theithecker@fs.fed.us (T. D. Heithecker), chalpern@u.washington.edu (C. B. Halpern)

1. Introduction

In the Pacific Northwest, variable-retention harvests that retain elements of old forest structure (large live trees, snags, and logs) have replaced clearcut logging on federal forests within the range of the northern spotted owl (Franklin et al., 1997; (Franklin et al., 1997; Aubry et al., 1999; Beese et al., 2003). Current

federal standards require that live trees are retained across a minimum of 15% of each harvest unit (USDA and USDI 1994) to moderate loss of biological diversity and to facilitate recovery of the regenerating forest. Although there are various mechanisms by which overstory retention can minimize species' loss and facilitate ecosystem recovery, it is generally assumed that amelioration of environmental stress (excess solar radiation, extremes in temperature, or soil moisture deficit) plays a critical role (Chen et al., 1992; Chen et al., 1995; Franklin et al., 1997; Barg and Edmonds, 1999). However, few studies have examined the relationships between microclimate and forest structure in the context of variable-retention systems (but see Barg and Edmonds, 1999; Chen et al., 1999; Zheng et al., 2000).

Some aspects of microclimate show strong and predictable relationships with forest structure. For example, solar radiation at the forest floor is directly related to the amount and spatial distribution of overstory cover (Drever and Lertzman, 2003). Other elements of microclimate are less predictable from forest structure. For example, soil and ground-surface temperatures are affected by incoming (short-wave) and outgoing (long-wave) radiation, which are determined, in part, by the full vertical profile of vegetation cover (Yoshino, 1975; Aussenac, 2000; Prevost and Pothier, 2003). Removal of canopy cover increases solar radiation which should elevate daytime temperatures; however, this should also result in greater loss of long-wave radiation, thus lowering nighttime temperatures and increasing potential for frost (Groot and Carlson, 1996). Canopy removal can also facilitate growth of understory vegetation, thereby reducing heat exchange with the soil and mitigating loss of overstory cover. Effects of forest structure on soil moisture may also be difficult to predict: reductions in canopy cover may lead to more evaporation from the soil surface (Morecroft et al., 1998; Chen et al., 1999), but less transpirational loss (e.g., Breda et al., 1995).

Dispersed retention of trees should serve to moderate forest-floor microclimate and thus benefit organisms sensitive to excess solar radiation or extremes in temperature. Logically,

these benefits should increase with the amount of retention. However, little research has been devoted to understanding the nature of this relationship (e.g., the existence of thresholds), or to identifying the features of residual forest structure that most influence microclimatic variation (Barg and Edmonds, 1999; Drever and Lertzman, 2003). Relative to clearcut logging, dispersed retention should also affect the spatial variability of microclimate in the forest understory. Patchy shading by residual trees, local accumulations of logging slash, and differential survival and growth of ground vegetation should increase the spatial heterogeneity of light, temperature, and soil moisture, and thus spatial variability in the survival of forest organisms that are sensitive to variation in these environmental factors (Hungerford and Babbitt, 1987; McInnis and Roberts, 1995; Gray and Spies, 1997; Grimmond et al., 2000; Martens et al., 2000). However, to date, studies of forest microclimate have emphasized the average conditions of harvest treatments, not the magnitude or sources of variation within them (but see Chen et al., 1999; Zheng et al., 2000; Drever and Lertzman, 2003)

In this study we examine patterns of microclimatic variation among harvest treatments that represent a broad gradient in overstory retention in mature, coniferous forests of western Washington. The treatments are part of the Demonstration of Ecosystem Management Options (DEMO) Study, a regional experiment in variable-retention harvest that evaluates the roles of level and pattern of retention in the persistence and recovery of organisms associated with late-seral forests (Aubry et al., 1999; Halpern et al., 2005). We assess variation in light, air and soil temperature, and soil moisture among and within harvest treatments and identify the components of residual forest structure (including overstory characteristics, understory vegetation, and logging slash) that best explain this variation. We address the following questions: (1) How do treatment-scale patterns of light, air and soil temperature, and soil moisture vary with level of retention? (2) Is the spatial heterogeneity (within-treatment variation) of light, temperature, or soil moisture greater at intermediate levels of retention,

reflecting the greater dispersion of trees? (3) Which elements of residual forest structure, including overstory characteristics, understory vegetation, and logging slash explain local variation in microclimate? We conclude by examining whether microclimate trends among treatments are consistent with the biological responses that have been observed in companion studies on these sites.

2. Methods

2.1. Study areas

This study was conducted at three of the six experimental blocks that comprise the DEMO study — Butte (BU), Little White Salmon (LWS), and Paradise Hills (PH). All are located in the southern Cascade Range of Washington (Aubry et al., 1999). The climate of this region is characterized by relatively warm, dry summers and cool, wet winters with most precipitation falling between October and April (Franklin and Dyrness, 1988). However, local climatic conditions vary both among and within the experimental blocks, reflecting variation in latitude, elevation, and aspect (Table 1) (see also Halpern et al., 1999; Halpern et al., 2005). Soils are moderately deep and well-drained loams to loamy sands derived from andesite, basalt, or breccia parent materials, or from aerial deposits of pumice (Wade et al., 1992). Three forest zones are represented, defined by the climax tree species: *Tsuga heterophylla* (BU), *Abies grandis* (LWS), and *Abies amabilis* (PH). At the time of harvest, forests were dominated by *Pseudotsuga menziesii* with no previous history of management. Forest age and structure varied greatly among blocks, and to a degree, among treatment units within blocks (Table 1). BU (70-80 years) and PH (110-140 years) were relatively dense forests (~1000 trees ha⁻¹); LWS (140-170 years) was characterized by large, widely spaced trees (~220 trees ha⁻¹) (Table 1). Understory development also varied markedly among blocks: herb and shrub cover were much higher at LWS (43 and 69%, respectively) than at BU (27 and 20%) or PH (19 and 13%) (Halpern et al., 2005).

2.2. Experimental treatments

The DEMO experimental design consists of six, 13-ha treatments randomly assigned to experimental units within each block. Treatments differ in level of retention (percentage of original basal area) and/or the spatial pattern in which trees are retained (dispersed vs. aggregated) (details can be found in Aubry et al., 1999). For this study, four of these treatments were selected to represent a gradient of dispersed overstory retention (Fig. 1):

1. 100%: control, no harvest.
2. 40% dispersed (40%D): residual trees are dominants or co-dominants evenly dispersed through the harvest unit.
3. 15% dispersed (15%D): residual trees are dominants or co-dominants evenly dispersed through the harvest unit.
4. 0%: represented by the harvested portions of the 15% aggregated-retention treatment (15%A) within which all merchantable trees (>18 cm dbh) were removed. Smaller trees were retained at BU, were felled at PH, and were largely absent at LWS.

Because the initial density and basal area of trees varied widely among blocks, treatments at a common level of retention often exhibited wide variation in residual density and basal area (Table 1).

Yarding was conducted with helicopters at BU and LWS, and with ground-based machinery at PH. Harvest operations were completed in fall 1997 at BU and PH, and in fall 1998 at LWS (for details see Halpern and McKenzie, 2001; Halpern et al., 2005).

2.3. Sampling design

Microclimatic measurements were taken during summer 2004, 6-7 years after harvest. Within each experimental unit, we randomly selected 20 (in one case 21) from a pool of 22-32 permanent tree plots (0.04 ha; 11.3 m radius) spaced 40 m apart on a systematic grid of 7 x 9 or 8 x 8 points (Halpern et al., 2005). To represent the 0% retention treatment, only plots within the harvested portion of 15%A were considered (Fig. 1). Within each plot a microclimatic station was established in a

random direction 1.5 m from the plot center. At each point we measured slope, aspect (transformed to “southwestness” [$\cos(\text{aspect} - 225^\circ)$]), and four microclimatic variables: light, air temperature, soil temperature, and soil moisture, as described below.

2.4. Microclimatic measurements

2.4.1. Light

An index of light availability was obtained from a hemispherical photograph of the forest canopy. A Nikon Coolpix 990 digital camera with a Nikon FC-E8 fisheye converter was leveled on a monopod at a height of 2 m from the ground surface (above understory vegetation except at LWS where vine maple was occasionally taller), with the top of the camera oriented north. Photographs were taken under overcast sky conditions between June and November 2004. Images were analyzed with the software Gap Light Analyzer 2.0 (GLA; Frazer et al., 1999), employing the standard overcast sky model (UOC). Total transmitted light, or photosynthetic photon flux density (PPFD; $\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{day}^{-1}$), was calculated for the growing season (June through September) (Frazer et al., 1999; Drever and Lertzman, 2003).

2.4.2. Air and soil temperature

Air and soil temperature were measured using temperature data loggers (Model DS1921G, iButton Thermochron, Maxim/Dallas Semiconductor Corp., Dallas, Texas). Two loggers were placed at each point: the first on a wooden stake 1 m above the ground surface (air), the second at 15 cm beneath the soil surface (soil). For measurements of air temperature, loggers were placed on the inside of one-half of a small (10 cm long) plastic container shielded with aluminum foil to prevent direct radiation, and perforated to allow airflow and minimize heat accumulation. Plastic containers were attached to a wooden “arm” extending perpendicular from the top of each stake. Temperature was recorded hourly at each point over a 2-3 week period between mid July and late September 2004 to sample the most stressful portion of the growing season. Measurements were taken synchronously within each block, but sampling was staggered in time

among blocks (LWS: 19 July - 5 August, BU: 10-31 August, and PH: 1-23 September).

2.4.3. Soil moisture

Volumetric soil moisture was measured using time domain reflectometry (TDR; Gray and Spies, 1995). Stainless steel probes, 30 cm long, were inserted at an angle of 30° from the soil surface to sample the upper 15 cm of soil; probes remained in place for the entire sampling period. Multiple measurements were taken over the growing season. At each measurement, all points within a block were sampled over a 1-2 day period of dry weather (no precipitation in the previous 48 hr) and all blocks were visited within the same 1-week period. Probes were attached to a TDR monitor with alligator clips soldered to coaxial wire; data were recorded on a palmtop computer. Volumetric soil moisture was calculated using the calibration curves of Gray and Spies (1995).

2.5. Overstory structure and understory cover

Within each tree plot, all stems ≥ 5 cm in diameter at breast height (dbh) were measured for diameter. Heights of all trees were estimated from species- and treatment-specific height:diameter equations (D. Maguire, unpublished data). Four predictors of overstory structure were then generated for each plot: total tree density, total basal area, a simple stand-density index ($[\text{density} * \text{basal area}]^{1/2}$), and total tree height (summed height of all trees; Drever and Lertzman, 2003). In addition, overstory canopy cover (%) was calculated from the hemispherical photograph taken at the center of each plot (GLA; Frazer et al., 1999).

To quantify the potential shading effects on soil of understory vegetation and logging slash, we made two additional estimates. Using a 1-m² frame centered on each microclimatic station, we visually estimated the cover (nearest 1%) of vegetation <1.5 m tall and logging slash (fine branches and other woody debris resulting from harvest operations).

2.6. Data reduction

From the continuous measurements of air and soil temperature, we grouped days as either

warm/sunny or cool/cloudy (Fig. 2). Given the emphasis of this study on amelioration of microclimatic stress, we randomly selected 5 days from the pool of warm/sunny days at each block. Based on hourly readings at each sample point, we calculated a mean daytime temperature for air (06:00 to 20:00 hr) and soil (09:00 to 23:00 hr, displaced 3 hr to capture the heating lag between air and soil). We also identified the minimum and maximum temperatures at each point for each day. For each of these (mean, minimum, and maximum), we then computed means of the 5 days at each point. From these 5-day, point-scale means we generated a mean and coefficient of variation (CV) for each treatment unit. These yielded a total of 12 “response variables” for air and soil temperature.

For analysis of soil moisture, one measurement was selected for each block — the driest during the growing season. Although minimum soil moisture can occur during early fall in Pacific Northwest forests (Gray and Spies, 1997), several extended periods of precipitation precluded use of September samples. Instead, for each block, we used a measurement from the period 4-12 August 2004. As with air and soil temperature, a mean and coefficient of variation were computed for each treatment unit.

In six of the 12 treatment units, measurements of temperature or soil moisture from one or two sample points were deleted from the analysis because data loggers or soil moisture probes were damaged or disturbed; final sample sizes per treatment unit ranged from 18 to 20.

2.7. Statistical analyses

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to confirm that residual forest structure differed significantly among harvest treatments. A randomized block ANOVA model was run for each measure of forest structure: tree density, basal area, stand density index, total tree height, and overstory canopy cover (with degrees of freedom of 2 [block], 3 [treatment], and 6 [error]). Treatment effects were judged to be significant at $\alpha \leq 0.05$. Individual treatment means were then compared with a Tukey HSD test (Zar, 1999). Tree density and total tree

height were log transformed prior to analysis to correct for heterogeneity of variance.

Randomized block ANOVA was also used to compare microclimatic variables among treatments, both for mean responses (Question 1) and within-treatment variability (CVs) (Question 2). Variation attributable to geographic location and to the staggered sampling of blocks through time was subsumed in the “block” term. Diagnostic tests revealed minimal departures from normality and homogeneity of variance among treatments, thus microclimatic data were not transformed. For ANOVA models in which there was a significant main effect, treatment means were compared with a Tukey HSD test. We tested for additional variation in microclimate attributable to topography and residual forest structure with analysis of covariance (ANCOVA). Covariates included treatment-level means for slope, southwestness (aspect), overstory canopy cover, and the four predictors of overstory structure (see *Section 2.5*). None of the covariates were significant in these models; consequently, only the results of ANOVA are presented.

Multiple linear regression was used to explore relationships between microclimate and measures of local (plot-scale) forest structure, including overstory and understory characteristics (Question 3). Because climate varied significantly among blocks, separate models were developed for each block ($n = 77$ - 80 sample points per block derived from all treatments). From the full set of predictors, stepwise selection (Zar, 1999) was used to add those variables to the model with the lowest probability of F at each step; variables already present were dropped if their probability of F exceeded 0.05. Standard diagnostics were used to test the assumptions of normality and constant variance of residuals. As a result, tree density and total tree height were log transformed. Several models were based on a reduced set of predictors. For PPF, the predictors slope, aspect, and overstory canopy cover were not considered because they are used implicitly in the calculation of light availability. For PPF and mean, maximum and minimum air temperatures, cover of understory vegetation and slash were not considered.

3. Results

3.1. Residual stand structure

ANOVA models confirmed that most measures of residual forest structure varied significantly with level of retention (Fig. 3). However, for several variables — basal area, density, and total height — one or more pairs of “neighboring” treatments did not differ significantly in *post-hoc* comparisons. Nevertheless, for all measures of residual forest structure, treatment means showed a monotonic increase with level of retention (Fig. 3).

3.2. General microclimatic trends

Air and soil temperatures varied significantly among blocks (Fig. 4), reflecting differences in geographic location, elevation, and time of sampling. Blocks differed both in the mean and range of daily temperatures. Trends over the course of the day were generally similar among treatments within each block except at LWS where minimum and maximum temperatures occurred ca. 2 hr earlier in the control (100% retention), reflecting its distinct easterly aspect (Fig. 4; Table 1).

3.2.1. Mean responses

Transmitted light (PPFD) and mean daytime and maximum air and soil temperatures decreased significantly with level of retention (Question 1) (Fig. 5). PPFD (Fig. 5a) showed the strongest trend, but values did not differ between 40 and 100% retention. Mean air temperature was significantly greater at 0% than at 40 or 100% retention; however, means did not differ between “neighboring” levels of retention (Fig. 5c). Maximum air temperature did not differ among 0, 15, and 40% retention or between 40 and 100% retention, but it was significantly greater at 0 and 15% retention than in the control (Fig. 5c). Mean and maximum soil temperatures (Fig. 5e) showed similar trends, differing only between 0 and 100% retention. Minimum air and soil temperatures (data not shown) and mean soil moisture (Fig. 5g) did not vary significantly with level of retention.

3.2.2. Within-treatment variability

There were no significant differences in within-treatment (plot-to-plot) variability in microclimate (Question 2), but two trends were evident. Variability in PPFD exhibited a marginally significant increase (Fig. 5b), and variability in soil temperature, a marginally significant decrease with increasing retention (Fig. 5f). Variability in air temperature and soil moisture showed no discernable trends among treatments. CVs for air temperature were considerably lower (<5%) than those for the other microclimatic variables.

3.2.3. Forest structure and understory conditions as predictors of microclimate

In combination, topography, residual forest structure, and ground-surface variables were generally good predictors of microclimate in multiple regression models (Question 3) (Table 2). Coefficients of determination (R^2) ranged from 0.63 to 0.84 for PPFD, from 0.55 to 0.85 for mean/maximum air temperature, and from 0.25 to 0.61 for mean/maximum soil temperature. Models for minimum temperature explained less variation, but were comparable for air and soil (R^2 of 0.22 to 0.46 and 0.10 to 0.51, respectively). Models for soil moisture were consistently poor (R^2 of 0.11 to 0.28). Among blocks, models were consistently weaker for LWS than for BU or PH.

For light and air temperature, aspect and one or two measures of overstory structure (canopy cover, SDI, basal area, or total tree height) yielded highly significant models (Table 2). SDI was selected in all models of PPFD (canopy cover was not considered; see *Section 2.7*). Canopy cover was the most frequent predictor of air temperature (i.e., seven of nine models and all models of mean and maximum temperature). In contrast, cover of understory vegetation (and slash at BU) were consistently selected in models of soil temperature (Table 2). Neither overstory canopy cover, nor vegetation cover were consistently included in models of soil moisture.

4. Discussion

4.1. Mean responses to level of retention

We expected that with increases in overstory retention, light availability and mean and maximum temperatures would decline, and minimum temperatures and soil moisture would increase. Trends for transmitted light (PPFD) and mean and maximum temperatures were consistent with these expectations, although the absolute differences in temperature among most treatments were surprisingly small and non-significant. PPFD showed the strongest response to level of retention, declining more than three-fold across the treatment gradient. Nevertheless, light availability did not differ statistically between 40% retention and the control. This result is due, in large part, to trends at BU. Here, the combination of a more easterly aspect and shading by non-merchantable trees resulted in a relatively small difference (<30%) in PPFD between 40 and 100% retention (in contrast, the differences between treatments at LW and PH were >130%). This underscores the fact that light penetration to the understory can vary significantly at a given level of overstory retention depending on topography, initial forest structure, and treatment of sub-canopy trees during logging operations (Lieffers et al., 1999).

In contrast to light, differences in air and soil temperature among treatments were more difficult to detect. Even on warm sunny days, maximum air temperatures 1 m above the ground surface were comparable among harvest treatments (0-40%) and mean temperatures did not differ between 0 and 15 or 15 and 40% retention. Although these results do not point to a clear threshold, they do suggest that retention in excess of 15% is required to reduce average daytime temperatures from those in clearcut environments. These patterns are generally consistent with past work in the Pacific Northwest. In 60- to 70-year-old coniferous forests in western Washington, Barg and Edmonds (1999) documented comparable mean and maximum summer temperatures in clearcut and dispersed-retention harvest units (~30% of original basal area), as did Chen et al. (1999). However, the implications of trends observed at higher levels of retention in our study are less clear. The absence of differences between 40 and 100% retention suggest that 60% of original

basal area can be removed without affecting mean or maximum air temperatures in the understory. With relatively low replication of treatments, however, this result may also be an artifact of topographic variation at BU (Table 1): the 40% harvest unit faces eastward and lies 200 m higher in elevation than the control (which faces southeastward) resulting in noticeably cooler temperatures. This points to the broader challenge of detecting treatment effects in large-scale experiments in landscapes in which complex topography and variation in forest structure can interact with experimental responses.

Not surprisingly, temperatures 15 cm below the soil surface differed less among treatments than did air temperatures, which averaged ~5°C greater. Although mean temperatures consistently declined with level of retention, significant differences were observed only between 0 and 100% retention. Yet, it is possible that greater differences existed at shallower depths and at the soil surface, particularly in areas of exposed soil. It is also likely that differences in temperature were greater immediately after harvest when mineral soils were first exposed and understory plant cover was markedly reduced by logging disturbance (Halpern and McKenzie, 2001; Halpern et al., 2005). By contrast, regrowth of the understory was considerable after 6-7 years and plant cover was actually greater in 0% than in control plots (Table 1), likely tempering the extreme differences in overstory shading between these treatments.

Level of retention had no detectable effect on minimum air or soil temperatures. This result is consistent with observations of Barg and Edmonds (1999) and with their conclusion that partial canopy retention reduces loss of long-wave radiation to a greater degree than it limits input of short-wave radiation. Treatment effects on minimum temperatures may be stronger in topographic settings where cold air has greater potential to accumulate (Williamson and Minore, 1978; Groot and Carlson, 1996), and in spring or fall when the potential for frost is greater.

Consistent with temporal trends for this region (Gray and Spies, 1997), volumetric soil moisture (0-15 cm) was generally low in mid-

August, yet there was little variation among treatments (range of soil moisture of 14-17%). Barg and Edmonds (1999) were also unable to detect differences in soil moisture in late summer among clearcut, dispersed retention, and uncut forests. Two processes with opposing effects may contribute to the small differences in soil moisture among harvest units with contrasting overstory structure. At lower levels of retention, greater heating of the soil surface should lead to greater evaporation; however, transpiration by trees should also be reduced due to lower tree densities. Rates of evaporation and transpiration are also likely to be affected by understory vegetation through variation in foliar cover, root system development, and water-use of plant species (Joffre and Rambal, 1993; Breshears et al., 1998; Xu et al., 2002). A clearer picture of soil moisture dynamics would require a more complete understanding of these factors and their interactions.

4.2. Within-treatment variation in microclimate

We expected that greater variability in overstory structure within dispersed treatments (15% and 40%) would lead to greater variability in understory microclimate than in clearcut or undisturbed forests. However, we were unable to detect a significant effect of retention level on coefficients of variation for any of the variables considered. For air temperature, rapid mixing of air masses (Chen and Franklin, 1997) is a likely explanation for the small variation (CVs <5%) among harvest treatments. Although not statistically significant, CVs for soil temperature showed an interesting and potentially relevant trend when considered together with treatment-scale differences. CVs for mean and maximum soil temperature increased with decreasing retention; thus, not only were average temperatures of treatment units greater at lower retention, but within-treatment variability was higher, increasing the potential for unusually high temperatures at particular locations. These effects could have been accentuated at shallower soil depths (or at the surface), particularly after harvest when residual plant cover was low.

It is possible that the general absence of treatment effects on microclimatic variation within harvest units reflects the spatial scale of

sampling. The distances between sample points (40 to >100 m) may be too large to capture the variation associated with overstory structure, particularly at higher levels of retention. Greater variability may instead be detected at finer spatial scales, e.g., within 1-5 m associated with individual tree canopies (but see Barg and Edmonds, 1999).

4.3. Predicting microclimate from attributes of forest structure

To what extent can variation in local microclimate be predicted by residual forest structure? Multiple regression models indicated that simple measures of overstory structure explained much of the variation in light availability and air temperature. Stand density index, which incorporates both the number and basal area of trees, emerged as the strongest predictor of light in all blocks, suggesting that both the density and sizes of trees contribute to light attenuation in the understory. This result is not particularly surprising, as light has been modeled with similar plot-scale measures of structure (e.g., basal area, stem density, or the summed diameters or heights of trees) in both coniferous and broadleaf forests (e.g., Palik et al., 1997; Comeau and Heineman, 2003; Drever and Lertzman, 2003). However, attempts to predict local variation in other characteristics of forest microclimate (e.g., air or soil temperature) are less common in the literature (but see Kang et al., 2000). Our results suggest that mean and maximum air temperature (at least for warm summer days) can be predicted from forest structure and aspect. Canopy cover (estimated from hemispherical photographs) was a significant predictor in all blocks, reflecting the strong relationships among canopy cover, solar radiation, and energy balance at the forest floor (Yoshino, 1975; Aussenac, 2000). In contrast, we could explain considerably less variation in soil temperature and very little variation in soil moisture. Models for soil temperature included not only overstory attributes (canopy cover or SDI), but cover of understory plants, as shading by herbaceous and woody vegetation can contribute significantly to moderation of soil temperatures (Pierson and Wight, 1991; Breshears et al., 1998; Buckley et al., 1998; Xu

et al., 2002). Interestingly, cover of logging slash was a significant predictor of soil temperature at BU 7 years after treatment. This suggests that its ameliorating effect was likely to have been stronger immediately after harvest when slash cover and depth were greater (Halpern and McKenzie, 2001). In fact, moderate levels of slash were positively correlated to initial survival of shade-tolerant herbs in these sites (Nelson and Halpern, 2005a). Clearly, however, factors other than overstory structure and understory cover contribute to local variation in soil microclimate. Models for soil temperature at LWS and models for soil moisture at all blocks were unable to account for most of this variation. Factors not sampled in this study may exert stronger controls on soil moisture; these include microtopography, soil texture, and organic matter content, which can vary considerably at small spatial scales (Gray and Spies, 1997; Messina et al., 1997; Breshears et al., 1998).

4.4. Correspondence of microclimatic and biological responses

Are trends in microclimate consistent with the biological responses documented in other studies on these sites? Studies of vascular plants, bryophytes, and fungal sporocarps, groups that should be sensitive to changes in light and temperature (Renhorn et al., 1997; Jones et al., 2003; Fenton and Frego, 2005), revealed initial (1-3 year) responses that were largely consistent with patterns of light availability, and to some extent, air and soil temperature. For example, declines in cover of forest herbs were greater at lower levels of retention, and plants typically associated with late-seral forests were more frequently lost from "clearcut" plots (0% retention) than from those with residual trees (15 or 40% retention) (Halpern et al., 2005). For forest-floor bryophytes, however, increasing levels of retention did not mitigate loss of cover (C. Halpern, unpublished data) suggesting that declines were either induced by other factors (e.g., physical disturbance) or by environmental stresses that were not measured (Saunders et al., 1991; Renhorn et al., 1997; Fenton and Frego, 2005). In studies of ectomycorrhizal fungi,

sporocarp (mushroom and truffle) production was virtually eliminated in clearcut areas (0% retention) and was significantly reduced at 15% retention (Luoma et al., 2004). At 40% retention, however, production of sporocarps was generally comparable to that in controls, consistent with trends in light and temperature.

Despite the many consistencies between microclimatic and biological responses, factors other than environmental changes can shape biological responses to overstory removal. For example, production of fungal sporocarps requires carbon subsidies from associated trees; greater retention may simply increase access to these subsidies. Variation in disturbance intensity also can play a critical role in survival of understory plants (Halpern, 1989; Haeussler et al., 2002; Roberts and Zhu, 2002; Fenton and Frego, 2005). Unfortunately, it is difficult to differentiate between the effects of disturbance and those resulting from physiological stress following timber harvest because they typically co-vary with level of retention (Halpern and McKenzie, 2001; Halpern et al., 2005).

4.5. Management implications

Structural retention is now a standard practice in harvest of mature forests on federal lands within the range of the northern spotted owl. Current standards require managers to retain at least 15% of the original stand within each harvest unit, with 70% of this retention in aggregates of 0.2-1.0 ha (USDA and USDI, 1994). Although this practice has been widely adopted, few data exist to evaluate whether this minimum retention standard is sufficient to achieve its intended goals. One mechanism by which overstory retention has been hypothesized to facilitate species' persistence and recovery is by moderating climate at the forest floor (Franklin et al., 1997). Our results provide direct evidence that at 15% dispersed retention, the potential for ameliorating air or soil temperatures in harvest areas is very limited. Although average levels of light are reduced, air and soil temperatures are not, resulting in mean and maxima that are no different from those found in clearcut environments. In operational applications of this minimum standard, where 70% of the tree cover must be aggregated, light

and temperature across most of the harvest unit are likely to be even greater. Studies of understory response (Luoma et al., 2004; Halpern et al., 2005; Nelson and Halpern, 2005a, b) and susceptibility of trees to wind-induced mortality (C. Halpern, unpublished data) further suggest that there may be few short-term benefits associated with this minimum standard. Yet, it is not clear at what point increases in retention above this minimum provide microclimatic benefits. This may depend, in part, on the microclimatic variables of interest and how they mediate biological responses. For example, mean air temperatures were significantly cooler than the clearcut at 40, but not 15% retention, whereas maxima were similar among all harvest treatments. Thus, biological processes mediated by extremes in temperature would suggest a different retention threshold than those shaped by average conditions. On the other hand, changes in light availability at lower levels of retention indicate that small increases in canopy cover can yield large reductions in light. If sensitivity to excess solar radiation dictates biological responses (Svenning, 2000; Coxson et al., 2003; Fenton and Frego, 2005), small changes in canopy retention could yield large effects.

The results of this study and of companion studies of biological response point to important relationships that warrant further investigation. For now, however, forest managers must continue to implement variable-retention designs with incomplete knowledge of their ecological consequences. Our study begins to fill some of these gaps in knowledge: it provides strong evidence that current minimum standards for retention do not substantially moderate the effects of canopy removal on understory microclimate.

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank Michael Olsen and Timothy Erickson for assistance in the field. Don McKenzie and Andy Gray provided input on sampling design and statistical analyses, and critical comments on an earlier version of the manuscript. We also appreciate the comments of two anonymous reviewers. This is a product

of the Demonstration of Ecosystem Management Options (DEMO) Study (<http://www.cfr.washington.edu/research.demo/>), a joint effort of the USDA Forest Service Region 6 and Pacific Northwest Research Station. Research partners include the University of Washington, Oregon State University, University of Oregon, Gifford Pinchot and Umpqua National Forests, and the Washington State Department of Natural Resources. Funds were provided by the USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station (PNW 97-9021-1-CA).

References

- Aubry, K.B., Amaranthus, M.P., Halpern, C.B., White, J.D., Woodard, B.L., Peterson, C.E., Lagoudakis, C.A., Horton, A.J., 1999. Evaluating the effects of varying levels and patterns of green-tree retention: experimental design of the DEMO study. *Northw. Sci.* 73, 12-26, (special issue).
- Aussenac, G., 2000. Interactions between forest stands and microclimate: ecophysiological aspects and consequences for silviculture. *Ann. For. Sci.* 57, 287-301.
- Barg, A.K., Edmonds, R.L., 1999. Influence of partial cutting on site microclimate, soil nitrogen dynamics, and microbial biomass in Douglas-fir stands in western Washington. *Can. J. For. Res.* 29, 705-773.
- Beese, W.J., Dunsworth, B.G., Zielke, K., Bancroft, B., 2003. Maintaining attributes of old-growth forests in coastal B.C. through variable retention. *For. Chron.* 79, 570-578.
- Breda, N., Granier, A., Aussenac, G., 1995. Effects of thinning on soil water balance and tree water relations, transpiration and growth in oak forest (*Quercus petraea* (Matt) Liebl.). *Tree Physiol.* 15, 295-306.
- Breshears, D.D., Nyhan, J.W., Heil, C.E., Wilcox, B.P., 1998. Effects of woody plants on microclimate in a semiarid woodland: soil temperature and evaporation in canopy and intercanopy patches. *Int. J. Plant Sci.* 159, 1010-1017.
- Buckley, D.S., Sharik, T.L., Isebrands, J.G., 1998. Regeneration of northern red oak:

- positive and negative effects of competitor removal. *Ecology* 79, 65-78.
- Chen, J., Franklin, J.F., 1997. Growing-season microclimate variability within an old-growth Douglas-fir forest. *Climate Res.* 8, 21-34.
- Chen, J., Franklin, J.F., Spies, T.A., 1992. Vegetation responses to edge environments in old-growth Douglas-fir forests. *Ecol. Appl.* 2, 387-396.
- Chen, J., Franklin, J.F., Spies, T.A., 1995. Growing-season microclimate gradients from clearcut edges into old-growth Douglas-fir forests. *Ecol. Appl.* 5, 74-86.
- Chen, J., Saunders, S.C., Crow, T.R., Naiman, R.J., Brosofske, K.D., Mroz, G.D., Brookshire, B.L., Franklin, J.F., 1999. Microclimate in forest ecosystem and landscape ecology. *Bioscience* 49, 288-297.
- Comeau, P.G., Heineman, J.L., 2003. Predicting understory light microclimate from stand parameters in young paper birch stands. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 180, 303-315.
- Coxson, D., Stevenson, S., Campbell, J., 2003. Short-term impacts of partial cutting on lichen retention and canopy microclimate in an Engelmann spruce - subalpine fir forest in north-central British Columbia. *Can. J. For. Res.* 33, 830-841.
- Drever, R.C., Lertzman, K.P., 2003. Effects of a wide gradient of retained tree structure on understory light in coastal Douglas-fir forests. *Can. J. For. Res.* 33, 137-146.
- Fenton, N.J., Frego, K.A., 2005. Bryophyte (moss and liverwort) conservation under remnant canopy in managed forests. *Biol. Conserv.* 122, 417-430.
- Franklin, J.F., Dyrness, C.T., 1988. *Natural Vegetation of Oregon and Washington*. Oregon State University Press, Corvallis, OR, p. 452.
- Franklin, J.F., Berg, D.R., Thornburgh, D.A., Tappeiner, J.C., 1997. Alternative silvicultural approaches to timber harvesting: variable retention harvest systems. In: Kohm, K.A., Franklin, J.F. (Eds.), *Creating a Forestry for the 21st Century*. Island Press, Washington DC, pp. 111-139.
- Frazer, G.W., Canham, C.D., and Lertzman, K.P. 1999. Gap light analyzer (GLA), version 2.0: imaging software to extract canopy structure and gap light indices from true-colour fisheye photographs. Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, B.C., and the Institute of Ecosystem Studies, Millbrook, N.Y.
- Gray, A.N., Spies, T.A., 1995. Water content measurement in forest soils and decayed wood using time domain reflectometry. *Can. J. For. Res.* 25, 376-385.
- Gray, A.N., Spies, T.A., 1997. Microsite controls on tree seedling establishment in conifer forest canopy gaps. *Ecology* 78, 2458-2473.
- Grimmond, C.S.B., Robeson, S.M., Schoof, J.T., 2000. Spatial variability of micro-climatic conditions within a mid-latitude deciduous forest. *Climate Res.* 15, 137-149.
- Groot, A., Carlson, D.W., 1996. Influence of shelter on night temperatures, frost damage, and bud break of white spruce seedlings. *Can. J. For. Res.* 26, 1531-1538.
- Haeussler, S., Bedford, L., Leduc, A., Bergeron, Y., Kranabetter, J.M., 2002. Silvicultural disturbance severity and plant communities of the southern Canadian boreal forest. *Silva Fenn.* 36, 307-327.
- Halpern, C.B., 1989. Early successional patterns of forest species: interaction of life history traits and disturbance. *Ecology* 70, 704-720.
- Halpern, C.B., McKenzie, D., 2001. Disturbance and post-harvest ground conditions in a structural retention experiment. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 154, 215-225.
- Halpern, C.B., McKenzie, D., Evans, S.A., Maguire, D.A., 2005. Initial responses of forest understories to varying levels and patterns of green-tree retention. *Ecol. Appl.* 15, 175-195.
- Halpern, C.B., Evans, S.A., Nelson, C.R., McKenzie, D., Liguori, D.A., Hibbs, D.E., Halaj, M.G., 1999. Response of forest vegetation to varying levels and patterns of green-tree retention: an overview of a long-term experiment. *Northw. Sci.* 73, 27-44 (special issue).
- Hungerford, R.D., Babbitt, R.E. 1987. Overstory removal and residue treatments affect soil surface, air, and soil temperature: implications for seedling survival. USDA Forest Service Research Paper INT-377,

- Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, Ogden, UT, p. 19.
- Joffre, R., Rambal, S., 1993. How tree cover influences the water balance of Mediterranean rangelands. *Ecology* 74, 570-582.
- Jones, M.D., Durall, D.M., Cairney, J.W.G., 2003. Ectomycorrhizal fungal communities in young forest stands regenerating after clearcut logging. *New Phytol.* 157, 399-422.
- Kang, S., Kim, S., Oh, S., Lee, D., 2000. Predicting spatial and temporal patterns of soil temperature based on topography, surface cover and air temperature. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 136, 173-184.
- Lieffers, V.J., Messier, C., Gendron, F., Comeau, P.G., 1999. Predicting and managing light in the understory of boreal forests. *Can. J. For. Res.* 29, 796-811.
- Luoma, D.L., Eberhart, J.L., Molina, R., Amaranthus, M.P., 2004. Response of ectomycorrhizal fungus sporocarp production to varying levels and patterns of green-tree retention. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 202, 337-354.
- Martens, S.N., Breshears, D.D., Meyer, C.W., 2000. Spatial distributions of understory light along the grassland/forest continuum: effects of cover, height, and spatial pattern of tree canopies. *Ecol. Model.* 126, 79-93.
- McInnis, B.G., Roberts, M.R., 1995. Seedling microenvironment in full-tree and tree-length logging slash. *Can. J. For. Res.* 25, 128-136.
- Messina, M.G., Schoenholtz, S.H., Lowe, M.W., Wang, Z., Gunter, D.K., Londo, A.J., 1997. Initial responses of woody vegetation, water quality, and soils to harvesting intensity in a Texas bottomland hardwood ecosystem. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 90, 201-215.
- Morecroft, M.D., Taylor, M.E., Oliver, H.R., 1998. Air and soil microclimates of deciduous woodland compared to an open site. *Agr. For. Meteorol.* 90, 141-156.
- Nelson, C.R., Halpern, C.B., 2005a. Short-term effects of timber harvest and forest edges on ground-layer mosses and liverworts. *Can. J. Bot.* 83, 610-620.
- Nelson, C.R., Halpern, C.B., 2005b. Edge-related responses of understory species to aggregated retention harvest in the Pacific Northwest. *Ecol. Appl.* 15, 196-209.
- Palik, B.J., Mitchell, R.J., Houseal, G., Pedersen, N., 1997. Effects of canopy structure on resource availability and seedling responses in a longleaf pine ecosystem. *Can. J. For. Res.* 27, 1458-1464.
- Pierson, F., Wight, J.R., 1991. Variability of near-surface soil temperature on sagebrush rangeland. *J. Range Manage.* 44, 491-497.
- Prevost, M., Pothier, D., 2003. Partial cuts in a trembling aspen - conifer stand: effects on microenvironmental conditions and regeneration dynamics. *Can. J. For. Res.* 33, 1-15.
- Renhorn, K.-E., Esseen, P.-A., Palmqvist, K., Sundberg, B., 1997. Growth and vitality of epiphytic lichens I. Responses to microclimate along a forest edge-interior gradient. *Oecologia* 109, 1-9.
- Roberts, M.R., Zhu, L., 2002. Early response of the herbaceous layer to harvesting in a mixed coniferous-deciduous forest in New Brunswick, Canada. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 155, 17-31.
- Saunders, D.A., Hobbs, R.J., Margules, C.R., 1991. Biological consequences of ecosystem fragmentation: A review. *Conserv. Biol.* 5, 18-32.
- Svenning, J.-C., 2000. Small canopy gaps influence plant distributions in the rain forest understory. *Biotropica* 32, 252-261.
- USDA, USDI. 1994. Final supplemental environmental impact statement on management of habitat for late-successional and old-growth related species within the range of the northern spotted owl. USDA Forest Service, Portland, OR,
- Wade, J.L., Herman, T.H., Couche, D. 1992. Soil resource inventory, Gifford Pinchot National Forest. Gifford Pinchot National Forest, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Portland, Oregon,
- Williamson, D.M., Minore, D. 1978. Survival and growth of planted conifers on the Dead Indian Plateau east of Ashland, Oregon. USDA Forest Service Research Paper PNW-242, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, Portland, OR, p. 15.

- Xu, M., Chen, J., Qi, Y., 2002. Growing-season temperature and soil moisture along a 10 km transect across a forested landscape. *Climate Res.* 22, 57-72.
- Yoshino, M.M., 1975. *Climate in a Small Area*. University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, p. 549.
- Zar, J.H., 1999. *Biostatistical Analysis*. Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, p. 663.
- Zheng, D., Chen, J., Song, B., Xu, M., Sneed, P., Jensen, R., 2000. Effects of silvicultural treatments on summer forest microclimate in southeastern Missouri Ozarks. *Climate Res.* 15, 45-59.

Table 1

Environmental attributes, post-harvest forest structure, and ground conditions in the four treatment units in each block

| Block | Level of retention (%) | Lat., long. (deg) | Stand age ^a (yr) | Elevation (m) | Slope (deg) | Aspect ^b (deg) | Basal area ^c (m ² ha ⁻¹) | Tree density ^c (no. ha ⁻¹) | Canopy cover ^d (%) | SDI ^e | Veg cover ^f (%) | Slash cover (%) |
|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|-------------|---------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| Butte | 0 | 46.37N, 122.20W | 70-80 | 988-1134 | 30 | 138 | 0.8 | 61 | 42 | 14 | 38 | 22 |
| | 15 | | | 1000-1195 | 31 | 151 | 13.3 | 151 | 64 | 72 | 34 | 20 |
| | 40 | | | 1195-1268 | 24 | 87 | 30.5 | 513 | 83 | 110 | 41 | 14 |
| | 100 | | | 963-1158 | 28 | 146 | 58.0 | 1014 | 89 | 152 | 19 | 0 |
| Little White Salmon | 0 | 45.86N, 121.59W | 140-170 | 792-939 | 29 | 74 | 0.5 | 51 | 47 | 11 | 83 | 8 |
| | 15 | | | 902-1012 | 23 | 324 | 7.6 | 45 | 58 | 38 | 83 | 8 |
| | 40 | | | 829-981 | 25 | 325 | 35.8 | 121 | 78 | 119 | 81 | 14 |
| | 100 | | | 841-1000 | 23 | 316 | 65.5 | 223 | 91 | 152 | 48 | 0 |
| Paradise Hills | 0 | 46.01N, 121.99W | 110-140 | 985-1027 | 6 | 157 | 0.2 | 48 | 39 | 4 | 25 | 32 |
| | 15 | | | 890-963 | 13 | 281 | 9.9 | 61 | 51 | 56 | 26 | 25 |
| | 40 | | | 927-972 | 5 | 346 | 23.0 | 128 | 71 | 93 | 26 | 16 |
| | 100 | | | 853-902 | 6 | 133 | 77.4 | 1003 | 90 | 176 | 18 | 0 |

All values (except for latitude longitude, stand age, and elevation) are based on means of 18-20 sample points per treatment

^a Age at time of harvest^b Derived from mean southwestness: $\cos(\text{aspect} - 225^\circ)$ ^c Trees ≥ 5 cm dbh^d Overstory canopy cover estimated from hemispherical photographs using GLA software (Frazer et al. 1999).^e Stand density index: $(\text{basal area} * \text{tree density})^{1/2}$ ^f Cover of understory vegetation <1.5 m tall (maximum 100%)

Table 2

Signs (+ and -) and *p* values of coefficients for significant predictors in multiple regression models of light (PPFD), temperature, and soil moisture

| Model/ Block ^a | Slope (deg) | SWness ^b | Tree density (no. ha ⁻¹) ^c | Basal area (m ² ha ⁻¹) | SDI | Overstory canopy cover (%) | Total tree height (m) ^c | Vegetation cover (%) | Slash cover (%) | R ² |
|--|-----------------|---------------------|---|--|------------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| <u>PPFD (mols m⁻² day⁻¹)</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| BU | nc ^d | nc | | | - / <0.001 | nc | | nc | nc | 0.84 |
| LWS | nc | nc | | | - / <0.001 | nc | | nc | nc | 0.63 |
| PH | nc | nc | | | - / <0.001 | nc | - / 0.021 | nc | nc | 0.82 |
| <u>Air temperature (°C)</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | | | | | | | | | | |
| BU | | + / 0.002 | | | | - / <0.001 | | nc | nc | 0.76 |
| LWS | | | | | | - / <0.001 | | nc | nc | 0.69 |
| PH | | + / 0.003 | | - / <0.001 | | - / <0.001 | | nc | nc | 0.85 |
| Maximum | | | | | | | | | | |
| BU | | + / <0.001 | | - / 0.001 | | - / <0.001 | | nc | nc | 0.78 |
| LWS | | + / <0.001 | | | | - / <0.001 | | nc | nc | 0.55 |
| PH | | + / 0.005 | | - / <0.001 | | - / 0.001 | + / 0.023 | nc | nc | 0.83 |
| Minimum | | | | | | | | | | |
| BU | | | | | + / <0.001 | | | nc | nc | 0.35 |
| LWS | + / <0.001 | | | + / <0.001 | | | | nc | nc | 0.22 |
| PH | | | | | | + / <0.001 | | nc | nc | 0.46 |
| <u>Soil temperature (°C)</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | | | | | | | | | | |
| BU | + / 0.036 | | | | - / <0.001 | | | - / 0.001 | - / 0.003 | 0.56 |
| LWS | | | | | | - / <0.001 | | - / 0.011 | | 0.22 |
| PH | | + / 0.019 | | - / 0.019 | | - / 0.003 | | - / 0.01 | | 0.61 |
| Maximum | | | | | | | | | | |
| BU | | + / 0.015 | | | - / <0.001 | | | - / 0.001 | - / 0.01 | 0.59 |
| LWS | | + / 0.035 | | | | - / <0.001 | | - / 0.018 | | 0.25 |
| PH | | | | | | - / 0.002 | - / 0.039 | - / 0.016 | | 0.57 |
| Minimum | | | | | | | | | | |
| BU | + / 0.012 | | | | | - / <0.001 | | - / <0.001 | - / 0.001 | 0.42 |
| LWS | | | | | | - / 0.003 | | - / 0.025 | | 0.10 |
| PH | | + / 0.004 | | | - / <0.001 | | | - / 0.001 | | 0.51 |

Table 2 (continued)

| Model/ Block | Slope (deg) | SWness | Tree density (no. ha ⁻¹) | Basal area (m ² ha ⁻¹) | SDI | Overstory canopy cover (%) | Total tree height (m) | Vegetation cover (%) | Slash cover (%) | R ² |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------|--|--|-----------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| <u>Soil moisture (%)</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| BU | | + / 0.036 | | | | | | + / 0.019 | | 0.11 |
| LWS | | - / 0.005 | | | - / 0.005 | + / <0.001 | | | | 0.28 |
| PH | | | | - / <0.001 | | | + / 0.03 | | | 0.17 |

^a Block codes are BU (Butte), LWS (Little White Salmon), and PH (Paradise Hills)

^b Aspect expressed as “southwestness” and computed as $\cos(\text{aspect} - 225^\circ)$ with a range of -1.0 to 1.0

^c Tree density and total tree height were log transformed

^d nc = predictor was not considered for this model




Fig. 1. Schematic representation of experimental treatments sampled for microclimate. Harvest units are 13 ha in area. Treatment codes are: 100% = control; 40%D = 40% dispersed retention; 15%D = 15% dispersed retention; and 15%A = 15% aggregated retention. Sample points representing 0% retention were restricted to harvested areas of 15%A.




Fig. 2. Daily fluctuations in air temperature (1 m from the ground surface) in the 0% retention treatment at PH. Dark lines represent sunny days ($n = 6$) and the remaining lines, cloudy days ($n = 16$). Each line is the mean of 20 sample points.




Fig. 3. Mean values (± 1 SE) of forest structural variables at four levels of retention. Block and treatment p values are from one-way randomized block ANOVAs. Treatments with different letters differ statistically ($p \leq 0.05$) based on a Tukey HSD test. Tree density and total tree height were log-transformed before analysis (untransformed values are presented here).




Fig. 4. Average daily fluctuations in air and soil temperature among experimental treatments at each block. Lines represent the means of all sample points ($n = 18-20$) for the five randomly selected warm/sunny days (see Section 2.6).




Fig. 5. (a-h) Mean values (±1 SE) (left column) and within-treatment variation (CVs ±1 SE) (right column) of microclimatic variables at four levels of retention. Block and treatment *p* values are from one-way randomized block ANOVAs. Treatments with different letters differ statistically ($p \leq 0.05$) based on a Tukey HSD test.